U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

U.S. Department of Agriculture
U.S. Forest Service

Bears Ears National Monument: Proposed Monument Management Plans and Final Environmental Impact Statement
Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units
Executive Summary

July 2019

Estimated Total Lead Agency Costs Associated with Developing and Producing this Document: $2,335,000

BLM Mission

It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

USFS Mission

The mission of the USDA Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations.

The Section 508 amendment of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 requires that information in federal documents be accessible to individuals with disabilities. The agencies have made every effort to ensure that the information in this document is accessible.
If you have problems accessing the information contained herein, please contact
Jacob Palma, Bureau of Land Management Monument Manager,
at (435) 587-1500 or jepalma@blm.gov.

BEARS EARS NATIONAL MONUMENT
MONUMENT MANAGEMENT PLANS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Responsible Agencies: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service

Document Status: Draft ( ) Final (X)

Abstract: These Monument Management Plans (MMPs)[1] and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) have been prepared by the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Department of Agriculture U.S. Forest Service (USFS) with input from cooperating agencies and American Indian Tribes. The purpose of the MMPs is to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values including the "object[s] of antiquity" and "objects of historic or scientific interest" of the Bears Ears National Monument (BENM, or Monument) that were identified in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. The MMPs will also provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM's and USFS's allocation of resources and management of the public lands within the BENM pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the National Forest Management Act, and the specific direction in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. The MMPs approved by the BLM would amend the existing *2008 Bureau of Land Management Monticello Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan*, as amended (hereafter referred to as the Monticello RMP), to remove the BENM from the Monticello RMP Decision Area and would replace the management from the Monticello RMP for the BLM-administered lands within the Monument. The USFS would use the information in the MMPs/EIS to amend the existing 1986 Manti-La Sal National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended (hereafter referred to as the Manti-La Sal LRMP) to guide future management of USFS-administered lands within the BENM.

The EIS describes and analyzes five alternatives for managing the Monument's Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units on approximately 201,876 acres of lands administered by the BLM and the USFS. The No Action Alternative (Alternative A) is a continuation of current management; under this alternative public lands and resources would continue to be managed under the Monticello RMP and the Manti-La Sal LRMP. All action alternatives were developed using input from the public, stakeholders, and cooperating agencies to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values. Alternative B would apply prescriptive land and resource use restrictions and would identify areas within the Planning Area for additional long-term protections of resource values. Alternative C emphasizes adaptive management. Alternative D would apply fewer land and resource use restrictions and allow for more discretion for multiple uses and review of actions on a case-by-case basis. Alternative E was developed in response to comments received on the Draft MMPs/EIS and includes elements of Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Alternative E is the BLM's and USFS's Proposed MMPs/preferred alternative. Major planning issues addressed include cultural resources, American Indian Tribal concerns, and recreation management.

Protest Period: A person who meets the conditions outlined in 43 CFR 1610.5-2 and wishes to file a protest must do so within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed MMPs may be found online at https://www.blm.gov/filing-a-plan-protest and at 43 CFR 1610.5-2. As allowed by 36 Code of Federal Regulations 219.59, the USFS is utilizing the BLM's administrative review processes.

Comment Period for Proposed Target Shooting Closure: A comment regarding the proposed closure that would prohibit target shooting at campgrounds, developed recreation sites, petroglyph sites, and structural cultural sites within the Monument must be received within 60 days of the date the Notice of Availability for the BENM Proposed MMPs/Final EIS is published in the *Federal Register*. Please refer to the Dear Reader letter for additional information regarding this comment period.

For further information, contact:

Jacob Palma, Monument Manager
(435) 587-1500; email: jepalma@blm.gov
ePlanning Website: https://goo.gl/XFr6V4
Bureau of Land Management, Canyon Country District Office
82 Dogwood Avenue
Moab, Utah 84532

[1] In this document, the BLM uses the term *Monument Management Plan* synonymously with the term *Resource Management Plan* as defined in 43 Code of Federal Regulations 1600 and in the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1).

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Utah State Office
440 West 200 South, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1345
http://www.blm.gov/utah

In Reply Refer To:
BLM/1610 (UT-935)

Dear Reader:

Enclosed for your review and comment are the Proposed Monument Management Plans/Final Environmental Impact Statement (Proposed MMPs/Final EIS) for the Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units of the Bears Ears National Monument (BENM, or Monument). The Proposed MMPs/Final EIS were prepared by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) pursuant to the BLM and USFS land use planning regulations (43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1600 and 36 CFR 219, respectively) and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The BENM was established by Presidential Proclamation 9558 on December 28, 2016. On December 4, 2017, Presidential Proclamation 9681 clarified and modified the designation of the BENM. The revised BENM boundaries include two separate units, known as the Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, that are reserved for the proper care and management of the objects of historic and scientific interest within their boundaries.

The Proposed MMPs/Final EIS analyze five alternatives for future management of the BENM Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, which include 201,876 acres of Federal lands in San Juan County, Utah. The Shash Jáa Unit contains 97,393 acres of BLM-administered lands and 32,587 acres of USFS-administered lands. The Indian Creek Unit contains 71,896 acres of BLM-administered lands. The MMPs approved by the BLM would amend the existing *2008 Bureau of Land Management Monticello Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan* (RMP), as amended, to remove the BENM from the Monticello RMP Decision Area and would replace the management from the Monticello RMP for the BLM-administered lands within the Monument. The USFS would use the information in the MMPs/EIS to amend the existing 1986 Manti-La Sal National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), as amended to guide future management of USFS-administered lands within the BENM.

The BLM and USFS have developed a range of alternatives to resolve resource conflicts that are reflected in the Proposed MMPs/Final EIS. The agencies have done this by considering 1) issues raised through public scoping and consultation and coordination with cooperating agencies and American Indian Tribes, 2) issues raised by agency resource specialists, 3) applicable planning criteria, 4) comments received on the Draft MMPs/EIS, and 5) government-to-government consultation with American Indian Tribes. This process has resulted in the development of four alternatives and the No Action Alternative, which represents a continuation of current management. These alternatives are described in their entirety in Chapter 2. Alternative E has been identified by the BLM and USFS as the Proposed MMPs/preferred alternative. Identification of the Proposed MMPs/preferred alternative does not constitute a final decision on the part of the BLM and USFS. Chapter 3 presents the affected environment and analyzes the potential impacts to resources or resource uses from implementation of the alternatives. Chapter 4 describes the BLM's and USFS's consultation and coordination efforts throughout the process.

Changes between the Draft MMPs/EIS and the Proposed MMPs/Final EIS include the development of Alternative E, modifications and clarifications of the analysis contained in the Draft MMPs/EIS, the addition of the analysis of potential impacts from Alternative E, a summary of the comments received during the public review period for the Draft MMPs/EIS, and responses to the comments received during the public review period for the Draft MMPs/EIS. These changes are indicated by gray shading in Chapters 1 through 4 and Appendices A through N of the Proposed MMPs/Final EIS.

The MMPs includes land use planning actions. A person who meets the conditions outlined in 43 CFR 1610.5-2 and wishes to file a protest must do so within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed MMPs may be found online at https://www.blm.gov/filing-a-plan-protest and at 43 CFR 1610.5-2. As allowed by 36 CFR 219.59, the USFS is utilizing the BLM's administrative review processes.

In addition, pursuant to the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act of 2019 (Dingell Act, Public Law 116-9, Section 4103), the BLM is soliciting comments on the proposed closure of target shooting on certain BLM-administered lands within the Monument. As proposed, target shooting would generally be allowed but would be prohibited at campgrounds, developed recreation sites, petroglyph sites, and structural cultural sites. The BLM is only accepting comments regarding the proposed target shooting closure. Any such comments must be received within 60 days of the date the Notice of Availability for the BENM Proposed MMPs/Final EIS is published in the *Federal Register*. Written comments may be submitted as follows (submittal of electronic comments is encouraged):

- Email: blm_ut_monticello_monuments@blm.gov
- Mail: Bureau of Land Management, Canyon Country District Office, 82 Dogwood Avenue, Moab, Utah 84532 Attn: Lance Porter

Before including your address, telephone number, email address, or other personally identifying information in your protest, be advised that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. You may request that the BLM withhold your personal identifying information from public review, but we cannot guarantee we will be able to do so.

The BLM Director will render a written decision on each protest. The decision will be mailed to the protesting party. The decision of the BLM Director shall be the final decision of the Department of the Interior on each protest. Responses to protest issues will be compiled and formalized in a Director's Protest Resolution Report made available following issuance of the decisions. Upon resolution of all protests, the BLM and USFS will issue Records of Decision (RODs) and Approved MMPs (BLM)/an approved LRMP amendment (USFS). The RODs and Approved MMPs (BLM)/approved LRMP amendment (USFS) will be made available electronically on the BLM's ePlanning website.

Thank you for your continued interest in the Bears Ears National Monument MMPs/EIS.

Sincerely,

Edwin L. Roberson
State Director

ABBREVIATIONS

ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
AMS	Analysis of the Management Situation
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act (of 1979)
ATV	all-terrain vehicle
AUM	animal unit month
BENM, or Monument	Bears Ears National Monument
BGEPA	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	best management practice
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DWFC	Desired Wildland Fire Condition
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ERMA	Extensive Recreation Management Area
ES&R	Emergency Stabilization & Reclamation
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FR	*Federal Register*
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	geographic information system
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
IRA	inventoried roadless area
ISRP	Individual Special Recreation Permits
LRMP	*Land and Resource Management Plan: Manti-La Sal National Forest*
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MFO	Monticello Field Office
MIS	management indicator species
ML	maintenance level
MLP	master leasing plan
MMP	Monument Management Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OHV	off-highway vehicle
PFC	proper functioning condition
PFYC	Potential Fossil Yield Classification

PIF	Partners in Flight
R&PP	Recreation and Public Purposes Act
RMP	Resource Management Plan
RMZ	Recreation Management Zone
ROD	record of decision
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
ROW	right-of-way
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIO	Scenic Integrity Objective
SITLA	School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration
SMS	Scenery Management System
SQM	Sky Quality Meter
SQO	Scenic Quality Objective
SRMA	Special Recreation Management Areas
SRP	Special Recreation Permit
SSS	special status species
SUA	Special Use Authorization
SUP	Special Use Permit
TCP	traditional cultural properties
UAVSs	unmanned aerial vehicles systems
UDWR	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
USC	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VCC	Vegetation Condition Class
VCMQ	Vegetation Classification, Mapping, and Quantitative Inventory
VMS	Visual Management System
VRI	Visual Resource Inventory
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WSA	Wilderness Study Area
WSR	Wild and Scenic River

ES.1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1.1. Introduction

The Bears Ears National Monument (BENM, or Monument) was established by Presidential Proclamation 9558 on December 28, 2016. On December 4, 2017, Presidential Proclamation 9681 clarified and modified the designation of the BENM. The revised BENM boundary includes two separate units, known as the Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, that are reserved for the proper care and management of the objects of historic and scientific interest within their boundaries. These two units together are referred to as the *Planning Area* in this document.

The Federal lands within the Planning Area are managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). Currently, these lands are managed under the *Bureau of Land Management Monticello Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan* (hereafter referred to as Monticello RMP), as amended (BLM 2008) and the *Land and Resource Management Plan: Manti-La Sal National Forest* (hereafter referred to as the Manti-La Sal LRMP), as amended (USFS 1986). The BLM and the USFS have prepared these Proposed Monument Management Plans (MMPs)[1] and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the BLM land use planning regulations (43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1600), USFS land use planning regulations (36 CFR 219), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. The BLM is preparing an MMP for the Indian Creek Unit and the BLM and USFS are jointly preparing an MMP for the Shash Jáa Unit. The EIS analyzes and discloses the potential environmental impacts of the agencies' approval of the MMPs and associated land use plan amendments and subsequent management of the Federal lands within the BENM subject to the approved MMPs.

The MMPs approved by the BLM would amend the existing Monticello RMP to remove the BENM from the Monticello RMP Decision Area and would replace the management from the Monticello RMP for the BLM-administered lands within the Monument. The USFS would use the information in the MMPs/EIS to amend the existing Manti-La Sal LRMP to guide future management of USFS-administered lands within the BENM. The USFS plan amendment is described in further detail in Appendix Q of the MMPs/EIS. Separate from the preparation of the MMPs, the USFS is in the process of completing a forest-wide LRMP revision. The resulting forest-wide LRMP would replace the Manti-La Sal LRMP.

Lands that were excluded from the BENM by Proclamation 9681 will continue to be managed by the BLM and USFS as currently directed under the Monticello RMP and the Manti-La Sal LRMP, respectively.

ES.1.2. Purpose of and Need for Action

The purpose of the MMPs is to provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM's and the USFS's allocations of resources and management of the public lands within the Planning Area pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandates of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976, and the specific direction in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. The purpose of the MMPs is to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values including the "object[s] of antiquity" and "objects of historic or scientific interest" of the BENM that were identified in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. These objects and values are also identified in Appendix A: Resources, Objects, and Values Identified within the Bears Ears National Monument.

The need for the MMPs is established by Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681, FLPMA, and NFMA. Presidential Proclamation 9558 states, "For purposes of protecting and restoring the objects identified above, the Secretaries shall jointly prepare a management plan for the monument and shall promulgate such regulations for its management as they deem appropriate." FLPMA requires that the BLM "develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land-use plans" (43 United States Code [USC] 1712 (a)). Similarly, the NFMA requires the USFS to "develop, maintain, and, as appropriate, revise land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest System" (16 USC 1604).

[1] In this document, the BLM uses the term *Monument Management Plan* synonymously with the term *Resource Management Plan* as defined in 43 CFR 1600 and in the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1).

ES.1.3. Issues and Related Resource Topics Identified through Scoping

The BLM and USFS identified issues to be addressed in the MMPs and EIS through public and internal scoping and through outreach to cooperating agencies and American Indian Tribes. Public comments were categorized in one of three ways: 1) issues to be addressed in the BENM MMPs/EIS, 2) issues to be addressed through policy or administrative action (and therefore not addressed in the MMPs/EIS), and 3) issues beyond the scope of the MMPs/EIS.

Many of the public comments received during the scoping period raised issues that were beyond the scope of the development of the MMPs. When deciding which issues to address, the agencies considered how the issues related to the purpose and need; whether the issues address points of disagreement, debate, or dispute regarding an anticipated outcome from a proposed action; whether a detailed analysis of environmental impacts related to the issue is necessary to make a reasoned choice between alternatives; whether environmental impacts associated with the issue are a significant point of contention among the public and other agencies; and whether there are potentially significant impacts on resources associated with the issue. Information about scoping meetings, comments received, comment analysis, and issues development can be found in the scoping report available on the BLM's ePlanning website at https://goo.gl/XFr6V4.

ES.1.3.1. Issues and Related Resource Topics Retained for Further Consideration in this MMPs/EIS

Table ES-1 presents the primary issues identified during scoping that are within the scope of the development of the MMPs. The level of detail in the description of each resource topic and the environmental impacts from implementing any of the alternatives are described in Chapter 3.

Table ES-1. Issues and Related Resource Topics

Resource Topic	Issues
Air resources	How would land management decisions in the BENM affect air quality, including emissions of criteria pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions, and impacts on air quality related values?
Cultural resources	How would the BLM and the USFS manage cultural resources to provide for the proper care and management of the Monument objects and values described in Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681? How would the management of recreation, livestock grazing, and other resource uses affect cultural resources including sites eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, traditional cultural properties, and American Indian sacred sites? How would the BLM and the USFS engage American Indian Tribes in the management and monitoring of cultural resources? How would the BLM and the USFS manage multiple uses within BENM without hindering access to or use of American Indian Tribes' traditional, ceremonial, and medicinal resources?
Fire management	How would land management decisions in the BENM affect fire management, fuel loading, and risk of wildfires?
Lands and realty	How would the BLM and the USFS manage the issuance of new rights-of-way (ROWs) and Special Use Permits (SUPs) to allow for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values?
Lands with wilderness characteristics (BLM)	How should lands with wilderness characteristics within the BENM be managed?
Livestock grazing	How would management of other resources and resource uses affect livestock grazing within the BENM?
Paleontological and geological resources	What management actions are necessary to provide for the proper care and management of the paleontological and geological objects and values of the BENM?
Recreation	How would the BLM and the USFS provide the appropriate recreation management levels in the BENM while providing for the proper care and management of other Monument objects and values? How would limitations on recreational activities be applied to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values? How would the limitations affect recreational experiences in the BENM?
Riparian, wetland, and water resources	How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect riparian areas, wetlands, and water resources?
Soil resources	How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect soils including soil crusts, soils sensitive to erosion, and other sensitive soils?
Social and economic considerations	How would land management decisions provide for and affect opportunities for local economic development, including tourism, livestock grazing, and other uses?

Resource Topic	Issues
Special designations	How would existing Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and their identified relevant and important values be properly cared for and managed?
Special status species	How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect special status species and their habitats? What management actions are necessary to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values related to special status species?
Travel and transportation management	Are changes to existing off-highway vehicle (OHV) use area designations or mechanized access necessary to provide for the proper care and management of the Monument objects and values? How would changes to existing OHV use area designations affect opportunities for OHV access and recreation within the BENM?
Vegetation	How would land management decisions and other resource uses in the BENM affect vegetation resources, including the potential for the introduction and spread of invasive and noxious species?
Visual resources and night skies	How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect scenic quality and integrity? How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect the visibility of night skies? How would the BLM and the USFS manage visual resources in the BENM to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values related to scenery?
Wildlife and fisheries	How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect wildlife, fish, and their habitats? What management actions are necessary to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values related to fish and wildlife?
Forestry and woodlands	How would forests and woodlands be managed to provide for the needs of local communities while providing for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values?

ES.1.3.2. Issues and Related Resource Topics Not Carried Forward for Additional Analysis

The BLM and the USFS are only required to analyze issues that respond to the purpose and need or when associated with significant effects. As part of the planning process for the BENM, the BLM and USFS identified several issues that do not meet these criteria. These resource topics and issues considered but dismissed from detailed analysis in this EIS are listed in Table ES-2 along with the rationale for dismissal.

Table ES-2. Issues Dismissed from Detailed Analysis

Resource Topic	Rationale for Dismissal from Detailed Analysis
Minerals	The issue/concern is the potential impacts resulting from mineral exploration and development in the BENM. Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681, withdrew all Federal lands and interests within the BENM from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or other disposition under the public land laws or laws applicable to the USFS, from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the Monument. Therefore, no mineral exploration or development would occur within the Planning Area except pursuant to valid existing rights. There are no authorized mineral leases, exploration, development, or production operations on federal lands within the BENM. A total of six unpatented placer mining claims are located on federal lands within the Shash Jáa Unit. An operator must attain the stated level of protection or reclamation required by specific laws in BLM and USFS-administered National Monuments pursuant to regulations at 43 CFR 3809.415(c). Because all Federal lands within the BENM are withdrawn from mineral entry, no significant effects from mineral entry are anticipated and this issue is dismissed from detailed analysis.
Public health and safety	The issue/concern is the potential impacts on public health and safety resulting from the MMPs. Consistent with national policy, the BLM and USFS will continue to work to identify and address all abandoned mine lands sites on public lands. Few mining claims and abandoned mine lands occur in the BENM. Other substantial impacts on public health and safety are not anticipated to occur as a result of the development of the MMPs. Impacts on public health and safety would be considered in subsequent implementation-level NEPA analyses as determined appropriate by the BLM and USFS. Because no significant effects to public health and safety are anticipated from programmatic, planning-level decisions, this issue is dismissed from detailed analysis.
Renewable energy	The issue/concern is whether the BLM and USFS should promote renewable energy development in the MMPs. The BLM and USFS have determined that identification of renewable energy zones is not appropriate within the BENM. Any application for land use authorizations for renewable energy would be processed and analyzed at the site-specific level through the BLM ROW and USFS SUP management decisions in the approved MMP. Because applications for renewable energy projects would be processed and analyzed at the site-specific level, they do not need to be addressed in a comprehensive framework for the BLM's and the USFS's allocation of resources and management of the public lands in the BENM. Thus, this issue was dismissed from detailed analysis because it does not respond to the purpose and need for the Federal action.

Resource Topic	Rationale for Dismissal from Detailed Analysis
Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) (BLM)	The issue/concern is whether the BLM should conduct a WSR evaluation of the rivers within the Planning Area in developing the MMPs. During the development of the Monticello RMP in 2008, the BLM conducted an evaluation of rivers within the Planning Area. The 2008 Monticello RMP found three river segments located within the Planning Area (Arch Canyon, Indian Creek, and San Juan River Segment 3) to be eligible but not suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Because they were determined to not be suitable for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System, the 2008 Monticello RMP determined that these three river segments would not be protected as eligible river segments. Appendix H of the 2008 Monticello RMP ROD describes the rationale for the eligibility and suitability determinations for each river segment. Conditions affecting the determination of suitability have not changed. Therefore, these river segments remain eligible but not suitable within these MMPs. Analysis of impacts to the identified outstandingly remarkable values (e.g., fish habitat, scenery, and recreation) of these segments was discussed in the 2008 Monticello RMP and will not be repeated within these plans. Because a WSR evaluation was conducted in 2008 and because conditions affecting the determination of suitability have not changed since then, a new WSR evaluation does not need to be addressed as part of the BLM's allocation of resources and management of the public lands in the BENM. Thus, this issue was dismissed from detailed analysis because it does not respond to the purpose and need for the Federal action.
Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) (BLM)	The issue/concern is whether the BLM should modify its management of WSAs within the BENM as part of the MMPs development process. The BLM's management policy for WSAs, excluding specifically excepted cases, is to continue to manage resource uses on lands designated as WSAs in a manner that does not impair the area's suitability for preservation as wilderness. All WSAs in the BENM are currently and would remain closed to OHV use, new ROWs, and other uses that would negatively impact their suitability for wilderness designation under all alternatives. These restrictions do not apply to activities outside of the WSAs because outside activities do not impact the suitability of WSAs for preservation as wilderness. Because WSAs in the BENM are currently managed, and will continue to be managed, to protect the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness, management of these areas does not need to be addressed in a comprehensive framework for the BLM's allocation of resources and management of the public lands in the BENM. Thus, this issue was dismissed from detailed analysis because it does not respond to the purpose and need for the Federal action.
Wilderness evaluation, WSRs, species of conservation concern, timber suitability (USFS)	The issue/concern is whether the USFS should conduct a wilderness evaluation, conduct a WSR eligibility study, identify species of conservation concern, or identify lands suited and not suited for timber production as part of the MMPs development process. The USFS is currently revising the 1986 Manti-La Sal LRMP under 36 CFR 219. Included in the revision process is the requirement to conduct a wilderness evaluation and a WSR eligibility study, identify species of conservation concern, and identify lands suited and not suited for timber production. These topics are being addressed by the USFS as a component of the ongoing Manti-La Sal National Forest forest-wide LRMP revision. The USFS conducted a statewide WSR evaluation in 2008 and found Whiskers Draw, Butts Canyon, Arch Canyon, and Texas Canyon Creek eligible but not suitable for recommendation for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Further results of that evaluation can be found in the *Record of Decision and Forest Plan Amendments – Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study for National Forest System Lands in Utah* (USFS 2008). Because these issues are being addressed as a component of the ongoing Manti-La Sal National Forest forest-wide LRMP revision, they do not need to be addressed in a comprehensive framework for the USFS's allocation of resources and management of the public lands in the BENM. Thus, these issues were dismissed from detailed analysis because they do not respond to the purpose and need for the Federal action.

ES.1.4. Alternatives Considered

To meet the purpose of and need for the plans, all action alternatives must be compatible with the proper care and management of the Monument objects and values outlined in Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681. The agencies have determined that all action alternatives that were retained for detailed analysis in the MMPs/EIS provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values as required by Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681. Multiple uses may be allowed to the extent that they are consistent with the proper care and management of Monument objects and values. The alternatives considered in the EIS address the issues identified through scoping that were within the scope of the development of the MMPs. The comparative analysis between alternatives establishes a framework for decision makers to understand important trade-offs and identify the most effective way to meet the purpose and need and to meet the BLM's and the USFS's multiple-use missions. The agencies' final decision on which alternative most effectively resolves resource and resource use conflicts while meeting the agencies' purpose and need and the direction provided by Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681, is made by the Authorized Officer (BLM)/Responsible Official (USFS).

ES.1.4.1. Alternative A: No Action Alternative

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, represents existing management mandated by current land use plans for the Planning Area and is composed of management decisions included in the Monticello RMP, as amended, and the Manti-La Sal LRMP, as amended, to the extent that the agencies have determined that those decisions are compatible with Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. Where the Presidential Proclamations modified existing management decisions, the

described management actions reflect the Presidential Proclamation direction. The Presidential Proclamations withdrew all Federal lands within the Monument from mineral entry and location, subject to valid existing rights; therefore, no minerals actions are included in Alternative A.

ES.1.4.2. Alternative B

Alternative B would apply prescriptive land and resource use restrictions, and would identify areas within the Planning Area for additional long-term protections of resource values. As with the other alternatives, this alternative provides specific direction for the management of Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) and Recreation Management Zones (RMZs). In general, this alternative provides guidance on the requirements for subsequent site-specific management actions, which ensures consistency but would be more prescriptive regarding how resources and resource uses are managed at the site-specific implementation level.

ES.1.4.3. Alternative C

Alternative C would provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values by emphasizing adaptive management. This alternative provides for protections of key areas and resources while allowing for flexibility in the management of resource uses. This alternative would require the monitoring of resource impacts and the implementation of more restrictive management actions if resource impacts exceeded acceptable thresholds. This alternative would be less prescriptive regarding how uses and activities are managed at the site-specific implementation level, as compared to Alternative B, while still providing enough direction to make the review of future site-specific actions easier and more consistent.

ES.1.4.4. Alternative D

Alternative D would provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values while applying fewer land and resource use restrictions and allowing for more discretion for multiple uses and review of management actions on a case-by-case basis, as compared to Alternatives B and C. In general, this alternative would be less prescriptive about how uses and activities are managed at the site-specific implementation level. However, this alternative would require additional environmental reviews of individual proposals and actions to establish appropriate uses and restrictions needed to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values, and to ensure consistency and compliance with overall management requirements.

ES.1.4.5. Alternative E (Proposed MMPs/preferred alternative)

Alternative E was developed in response to comments received on the Draft MMPs/EIS and includes elements of Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Similar to Alternative D, Alternative E would provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values while applying fewer land and resource use restrictions and allowing for more discretion for multiple uses and review of actions on a case-by-case basis, as compared to Alternatives B and C. In general, this alternative would be less prescriptive regarding how uses and activities are managed at the site-specific implementation level and would rely on environmental reviews completed for individual actions to establish appropriate uses and restrictions needed to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values. However, this alternative would require additional review of proposals during implementation to ensure consistency and compliance with overall management requirements.

ES.1.5. Summary of Environmental Consequences

This section summarizes and compares environmental consequences anticipated from implementing the alternatives considered in the EIS. A detailed description of environmental consequences is included in Chapter 3.

Table ES-3. Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Resource Topic	Action	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air resources	All land management actions	Impacts on air resources from management under all alternatives would include particulate matter (dust) and vehicle emissions. Alternatives A, C, D, and E would have a similar amount of area open to motorized travel, and measurable impacts on air resources from combustion and fugitive dust would likely be the same.	Alternative B would close certain areas to motorized travel, which could result in lower impacts on air resources than other alternatives.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
Cultural resources	All land management actions	All action alternatives include management actions designed to reduce or eliminate impacts to cultural resources, including objects identified in the Proclamations; however, certain alternatives provide more opportunities for multiple uses throughout the Monument (e.g., ROWs, recreation, grazing). Implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and compliance with applicable laws protecting cultural resources would protect cultural sites listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.				
	Tribal collaboration and cultural resource monitoring	The existing Monticello RMP and Manti-La Sal LRMP do not include an American Indian Tribal Collaboration Framework or a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan.	Under Alternatives B, C, D, and E, the BLM and USFS would implement an American Indian Tribal Collaboration Framework to involve the Tribes in the future management of the BENM. Additionally, the BLM and USFS would implement a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan and Cultural Resources Allocations Criteria and Management Strategies to reduce the impacts of visitation and other resource uses on cultural resources.			
	Recreation	Current management limits recreational use at some of the BENM's most well-known cultural sites and sensitive cultural areas.	Alternative B would have the most restrictive limits on recreational use in sensitive cultural areas. Impacts from recreation under this alternative would be lower than Alternatives A, C, D, and E.	Alternative C would implement stricter group size limits compared to Alternatives D and E. Because Alternative C would be more restrictive than Alternatives A, D, and E, the potential for impacts to cultural resources under Alternative C would be lower than the potential under Alternatives A, D, or E.	Alternative D would implement additional cultural resource protections and group size limits throughout the BENM. Because Alternative D would be less restrictive than Alternatives B, C, and E, the potential for impacts to cultural resources under Alternative D would be greater than the potential under Alternatives B, C, and E.	Alternative E would implement additional cultural resource protections and group size limits throughout the BENM. Generally, impacts under Alternative E would be similar to those under Alternative D but would provide clarifications on specific actions such as Special Recreation Permits and dispersed camping and would implement a more adaptive approach to addressing potential impacts to cultural resources from climbing.
	Lands and realty: Cultural Sensitivity in areas open to ROW applications	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,387 Medium: 31,547 Low: 26,884	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 0 Medium: 0 Low: 0	Same as Alternative B	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 5,914 Medium: 30,943 Low: 27,493	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 5,914 Medium: 30,943 Low: 27,493
		Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 35,158 Medium: 30,990 Low: 22,065	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 0 Medium: 0 Low: 0	Same as Alternative B	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 822 Medium: 669 Low: 7	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 822 Medium: 669 Low: 7

Resource Topic	Action	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Livestock grazing: Cultural sensitivity in areas open to livestock grazing	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,367 Medium: 31,314 Low: 26,957	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 816 Medium: 11,081 Low: 13,736	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,367 Medium: 31,322 Low: 26,957	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,366 Medium: 31,350 Low: 26,970	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,366 Medium: 31,350 Low: 26,970
		Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,159 Medium: 46,379 Low: 23,790	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 39,633 Medium: 30,172 Low: 17,897	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 54,900 Medium: 43,804 Low: 22,547	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 54,900 Medium: 43,804 Low: 22,547	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 54,900 Medium: 43,804 Low: 22,547
	Impacts from riparian management	All alternatives exclude riparian and/or aquatic areas from private or commercial use of woodland products but provide an exception for American Indian traditional use. All alternatives provide allowances for cottonwood and willow harvest with a permit for American Indian ceremonial uses.				
	Travel management: Cultural sensitivity in areas designated as OHV limited	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 2,413 Medium: 13,222 Low: 12,340	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779	Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779
		Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 23,760 Medium: 20,080 Low: 12,530	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389	Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389
Fire management	Fire management	Under all alternatives, wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources, and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. All alternatives would have the same priorities for fire suppression, areas where wildland fire could be authorized, fuel treatments, emergency stabilization and rehabilitation, and options to use wildland fire for resource benefit. Minor differences in opportunities for fuels management and vegetation treatments exist between the alternatives, but these are not anticipated to result in substantial differences in fire management between the alternatives.				
Lands and realty	Land use authorizations	Managing 202,700 acres (75%) of the Planning Area as open would allow the BLM and USFS to accommodate demand for new land use authorizations in those areas. There would be standard administrative requirements for the agencies' Lands and Realty Programs to process land use authorization applications.	Managing 100% (201,800 acres) of the Planning Area as ROW exclusion areas would result in neither the BLM nor the USFS being able to accommodate demand for future land use authorizations in the Planning Area.	Managing 156,200 acres (77%) of the Planning Area as ROW exclusion areas would limit opportunities for new authorizations to the remaining 45,500 acres (13%), managed as avoidance areas. However, avoidance criteria would limit, or in some cases preclude, new authorizations.	Most opportunities for new land use authorizations would be in open areas (64,300 acres) in the Indian Creek Unit. In the Shash Jáa Unit, opportunities for new authorizations outside exclusion and avoidance areas would be in the existing utility corridor and along state highways (1,500 acres), and 61% of the Planning Area would be designated as avoidance areas, which could limit or prevent new land use authorizations.	Most opportunities for new land use authorizations would be in open areas (64,300 acres) in the Indian Creek Unit. In the Shash Jáa Unit, opportunities for new authorizations outside exclusion and avoidance areas would be in the existing utility corridor and along state highways (1,500 acres), and 61% of the Planning Area would be designated as avoidance areas, which could limit or prevent new land use authorizations.

Resource Topic	Action	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Lands with wilderness characteristics	Areas managed to protect wilderness characteristics	0 acre	82,293 acres	43,166 acres	0 acre	0 acre
	Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics designated as OHV closed or OHV limited areas	Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,744 acres	Closed: 82,293 acres Limited: 0 acres	Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,791 acres	Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,791 acres	Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,791 acres
	Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics managed as ROW exclusion areas	1,228 acres	82,293 acres	65,830 acres	663 acres	663 acres
	Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics managed as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class I or II	VRM Class I: 1,857 acres VRM Class II: 45,603 acres	VRM Class I: 82,293 acres VRM Class II: 0 acre	VRM Class I: 43,392 acres VRM Class II: 38,032 acres	VRM Class I: 240 acres VRM Class II: 81,121 acres	VRM Class I: 240 acres VRM Class II: 81,121 acres
Livestock grazing	Closures to grazing	Impacts on livestock grazing could occur as a result of decisions to close portions of or entire active grazing allotments. Adverse impacts would also result from any use or activity that reduces the amount of available forage or restricts livestock movement and/or access to forage, such as fencing or other types of exclosures. Adverse impacts would result from limitations to permittees' ability to graze livestock.				
	Areas available (BLM)/suitable (USFS) or unavailable (BLM)/not suitable (USFS) for grazing	Area available (BLM)/suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 189,445 Area unavailable (BLM)/not suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 12,090	Area available (BLM)/suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 112,995 Area unavailable (BLM)/not suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 88,565	Area available (BLM)/suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 185,376 Area unavailable (BLM)/not suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 16,159	Area available (BLM)/suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 185,415 Area unavailable (BLM)/not suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 16,120	Area available (BLM)/suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 185,384 Area unavailable (BLM)/not suitable (USFS) for livestock grazing (acres): 15,821

Resource Topic	Action	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Paleontological and geological resources	Paleontological resource decisions	For BLM lands under Alternative A, collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, noncommercial use and pre-disturbance inventories would be required in Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) 5 areas. This would allow for impacts on existing fossil resources in the BENM from both private collection and inadvertent impacts from ground-disturbing activities. USFS lands within National Monuments are closed to casual collection of paleontological resources (36 CFR 291.12).	Under Alternatives B through E, collection of paleontological objects would be by permit only. Additionally, pre-disturbance inventories would be required in PFYC 4 and 5 areas (and PFYC 3 areas under Alternatives C and B). The Authorized Officer has the discretion to require surveys if needed. These actions would reduce the impacts on paleontological resources from private collection and inadvertent impacts on fossil and other paleontological resources in the Planning Area from surface-disturbing activities.			
Recreation	General management	Under all alternatives, the BENM would be managed to promote and develop recreation resources while maintaining areas for other resources (e.g., wildlife and fish) and minimizing user conflicts.				
	SRMAs, Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs), and RMZs	The following areas would be managed: Indian Creek SRMA Monticello ERMA Cedar Mesa SRMA Comb Ridge RMZ McLoyd Canyon-Moon House RMZ San Juan River SRMA	The following areas would be managed: Shash Jáa SRMA Indian Creek SRMA Indian Creek ERMA Trail of the Ancients RMZ South Elks/Bears Ears RMZ Arch Canyon RMZ Arch Canyon Backcountry RMZ McLoyd Canyon-Moon House RMZ San Juan Hill RMZ The Points RMZ Doll House RMZ	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
	Allowed recreational uses	Alternative A would provide for both private and commercial recreational use in the BENM. Recreational uses, including camping and group sizes, would be restricted in some areas to protect sensitive resources.	Alternative B would provide similar recreation management to Alternatives D and E; however, the most restrictive use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed to help reduce impacts on resources and resource uses.	Alternative C would provide similar recreation management as under Alternatives D and E; however, more restrictive use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed to help reduce impacts on resources and resource uses.	Alternative D would provide for both private and commercial recreational use in the BENM. Compared to Alternative A, moderate use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed. Portions of the Shash Jáa Unit would be managed to provide additional opportunities for cultural and heritage tourism.	Alternative E would provide for both private and commercial recreational use in the BENM. Compared to Alternative A, moderate use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed. Portions of the Shash Jáa Unit would be managed to provide additional opportunities for cultural and heritage tourism.

Resource Topic	Action	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Riparian, wetland, and water resources	Surface-disturbing activities	The nature of impacts on riparian, wetland, and water resources would be similar under all alternatives. Most direct and indirect impacts would occur from allowed surface disturbances. Surface disturbances could include clearing for land development, including roads, other ROWs, and other infrastructure. Surface disturbances could also occur from construction of livestock facilities, improper livestock grazing, vegetation treatments, off-road vehicle travel, and excessive dispersed camping.				
		Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 43% ROW avoidance: 55%	Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 48% Livestock grazing: 67% Open to ROW: 0% ROW avoidance: 0%	Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 0% ROW avoidance 28%	Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 19% ROW avoidance: 79%	Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 19% ROW avoidance: 79%
Soil resources	Soil management	Under all alternatives, management would maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of *Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management* (BLM 1997), *Rangeland Ecosystem Analysis and Monitoring Handbook* (USFS 2005) objectives, and other soil protection measures. Most direct and indirect impacts would occur from allowed surface disturbances. Surface disturbances could include clearing for land development, including roads, other ROWs, and other infrastructure. Surface disturbances could also occur from construction of livestock facilities, improper livestock grazing, vegetation treatments, off-road vehicle travel, and excessive dispersed camping.				
	Surface-disturbing activities	Acres of highly sensitive soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 25,783 Open to ROW: 27,369 Woodland harvest: 15,321	Acres of highly sensitive soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 11,393 Livestock grazing: 11,310 Open to ROW: 0 Woodland harvest: 9,016	Acres of highly sensitive soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 25,510 Open to ROW: 3,154 Woodland harvest: 12,893	Acres of highly sensitive soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 25,510 Open to ROW: 27,347 Woodland harvest: 12,893	Acres of highly sensitive soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 25,510 Open to ROW: 27,347 Woodland harvest: 15,321
Special designations	Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation and management	All alternatives would retain existing designations for the Shay Canyon, San Juan River, and Lavender Mesa ACECs. Management would protect the relevant and important values and other resources within the ACECs.				
Special status species	Species management	Special status species would be managed similarly under all alternatives, including providing for the application of BMPs and stipulations to all surface-disturbing activities to protect species and their habitats where present. Allowed surface disturbances could impact special status species and their habitats, including loss and fragmentation of habitat and displacement of individuals. These disturbances include clearing for land development (e.g., roads, other ROWs, and other infrastructure). Surface disturbances could also occur from construction of livestock facilities, improper livestock grazing, vegetation treatments, off-road vehicle travel, and excessive dispersed camping.				
	Surface-disturbing activities	Alternative A would allow the most surface-disturbing activities in the BENM. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats.	Alternative B would allow the least surface-disturbing activities and the least impacts on special status species. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats.	The impacts of Alternative C would be similar to Alternatives D and E. However, Alternative C would allow less surface disturbance compared to Alternatives D and E. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats.	The impacts of Alternative D would be similar to Alternative A. However, Alternative D would allow slightly less surface disturbance compared to Alternative A. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats.	The impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those of Alternative A. However, Alternative E would allow slightly less surface disturbance compared to Alternative A. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats.
Travel and transportation	OHV area designations	Limited: 174,743 acres Closed : 26,611 acres	Limited: 84,123 acres Closed: 117,579 acres	Limited: 174,743 acres Closed: 26,611 acres	Limited: 174,743 acres Closed: 26,611 acres	Limited: 174,743 acres Closed: 26,611 acres

Resource Topic	Action	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Vegetation	Vegetation decisions	Vegetation resources would be managed similarly under all alternatives, including providing opportunities for private and ceremonial gathering of vegetation products. Nonnative and invasive species would be controlled using similar methods under all alternatives. Allowed surface disturbances could remove vegetation under all alternatives. Alternatives that would allow more unrestricted surface disturbances would allow greater impacts on vegetation. Because of allowed surface disturbances, Alternative A would have the greatest impacts on vegetation, followed by Alternative B, C, and D/E respectively.				
Visual resources	VRM and scenic integrity objective (SIO) designations	Alternative A would have the least protection for visual resources, including the least acreage under VRM and SIO objectives that maintain Visual Resource Inventory (VRI) and existing scenic integrity values.	Under Alternatives B through E, the entire Monument would be managed at VRM Class I/SIO Very High or VRM Class II/SIO High, which would protect the scenic quality of the landscape over the life of the MMPs. Alternative B would have the largest acreages within the Planning Area under VRM and SIO objectives that maintain VRI and existing scenic integrity values, followed by Alternative C, then Alternative D.	Exceptions to VRM requirements would be allowed for construction of recreational infrastructure under Alternatives C, D, and E. The contrast would be allowed only to the extent needed for the function of the facility, which would reflect design excellence and be a positive element for the built environment following existing color, line, form, and texture. Structures would blend into the landscape while retaining functionality.	Exceptions to VRM requirements would be allowed for construction of recreational infrastructure under Alternatives C, D, and E. The contrast would be allowed only to the extent needed for the function of the facility, which would reflect design excellence and be a positive element for the built environment following existing color, line, form, and texture. Structures would blend into the landscape while retaining functionality.	Exceptions to VRM requirements would be allowed for construction of recreational infrastructure under Alternatives C, D, and E. The contrast would be allowed only to the extent needed for the function of the facility, which would reflect design excellence and be a positive element for the built environment following existing color, line, form, and texture. Structures would blend into the landscape while retaining functionality.
Wildlife and fisheries	Wildlife management	Wildlife and fisheries would be managed similarly under all alternatives, including providing for the application of BMPs and stipulations to all surface-disturbing activities to protect species and their habitats where present. The types of impacts and relative intensity of those impacts on wildlife and fisheries would be similar to the impacts described for special status species.				
Forestry and woodlands	Woodland product harvest	Alternative A would allow for private and commercial woodland harvest.	Alternatives B through E would allow for private woodland harvest only on BLM-administered lands. Commercial harvest and woodland activities would be allowed under all alternatives on USFS-administered lands, but would be designated as unsuitable for timber production, if needed, to provide for the proper care and management of Monument objects and values.			
	Area open for woodland product harvest	Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 82,729	Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 51,751	Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 71,678	Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 71,678	Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 82,729

ES.1.6. Summary of Consultation and Coordination

The BLM and USFS have involved the public and have coordinated with affected parties during the development of the MMPs/EIS. These efforts include public scoping; identifying and designating cooperating agencies; consulting with applicable Federal agencies and State, local, and Tribal governments; and accepting comments on the Draft MMPs/EIS.

ES.1.6.1. Public Scoping

The scoping period began on January 16, 2018, and extended through April 11, 2018. Public scoping meetings were held in the communities of Bluff and Blanding, Utah. In all, 165,466 submissions were received from the public during the scoping period. In addition to the scoping meetings, the BLM and USFS conducted an economic strategies workshop in Monticello, Utah, on June 6, 2018. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the issues related to the local economies and social conditions of the counties, towns, and cities in and around the Planning Area.

ES.1.6.2. Public Comments on the Draft MMPs/EIS

The BLM and USFS published the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft MMPs/EIS in the *Federal Register* on August 17, 2018. The publication of the NOA began a 90-day public comment period that ended on November 15, 2018. Comments on the Draft MMPs/EIS were accepted by the BLM and USFS using U.S. Postal Service mail, email, and hard copy at BLM and USFS offices during the 90-day public comment period. Additionally, the BLM and USFS hosted three open house–style public meetings to provide the public with an opportunity to ask questions and submit comments on the Draft MMPs/EIS in writing or verbally. Verbal comments received at the public meetings were recorded by a court reporter. The meetings were held in Blanding, Bluff, and Montezuma Creek, Utah.

The BLM and USFS received 250,484 comment submissions during the public comment period for the Draft MMPs/EIS. All comments were given equal consideration, regardless of the method of submittal. The agencies assessed and considered public comments received both individually and collectively during the public review period of the Draft MMPs/EIS. The BLM and USFS responded to all substantive comments received on the Draft MMPs/EIS (Appendix O: Responses to Public Comments on the Bears Ears National Monument, Draft Monument Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statement, Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units).

ES.1.6.3. Cooperating Agencies

Federal regulations direct the BLM and USFS to invite eligible Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Federally recognized American Indian Tribes to participate as cooperating agencies when drafting an EIS. The groups listed in Table ES-4 were invited to participate in the preparation of the MMPs/EIS as cooperating agencies. Those groups that accepted the invitation have participated in the development of the MMPs/EIS, including review of the alternatives and analysis contained in the document.

Table ES-4. Invited Cooperating Agencies and American Indian Tribes

Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperating Agencies	Agencies and Tribes that Accepted	Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperating Agencies	Agencies and Tribes that Accepted
Blanding City	X	Pueblo of San Ildefonso	
City of Monticello	X	Pueblo of Sandia	
Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservation		Pueblo of Santa Ana	
Grand County Council		Pueblo of Santa Clara	
Hopi Tribe		Pueblo of Santo Domingo (Kewa)	
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians	X	Pueblo of Taos	
National Park Service	X	Pueblo of Tesuque	
Navajo Nation		Pueblo of Ysleta del Sur	
Northwest Band of Shoshone Nation		Pueblo of Zia	
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah		Pueblo of Zuni	

Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperating Agencies	Agencies and Tribes that Accepted	Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperating Agencies	Agencies and Tribes that Accepted
Pueblo of Acoma		San Juan County	X
Pueblo of Cochiti		Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	
Pueblo of Isleta		Southern Ute Tribe	
Pueblo of Jemez		State of Utah	X
Pueblo of Laguna		State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration	X
Pueblo of Nambe		Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe	
Pueblo of Ohkay Owingeh		U.S. Forest Service	X
Pueblo of Picuris		Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	
Pueblo of Pojoaque		White Mesa Community of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	
Pueblo of San Felipe	X		

ES.1.6.4. American Indian Tribal Consultation and Coordination

Federal law requires the BLM and USFS to consult with American Indian Tribes during the planning and NEPA process. On approximately April 20, 2018, the agencies sent invitations to more than 30 Tribes inviting them to participate in a consultation meeting held in Bluff, Utah (Table ES-5). On May 10, 2018, BLM Utah leadership hosted an initial Tribal consultation meeting with the Tribes that were able to attend. The meeting format was arranged to allow for Tribal members to meet individually with the BLM and the USFS in the morning and for a joint meeting with all those present in the afternoon. Several BLM staff attended this meeting, including the State Director, District Manager, Project Manager, and several resource specialists. The USFS District Ranger and two planning team members from the Manti-La Sal National Forest also attended the meeting. The Tribal representatives present chose to forego the individual morning meetings and decided to meet as a group for the day. Of the 30 Tribes that were invited to participate, 11 Tribal members representing seven Tribes attended the May 10 meeting. Tribes that were present were the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Pueblo of Acoma, Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of San Felipe, Pueblo of Tesuque, and Ute Mountain Ute Tribe. Tribes requested that their concerns be acknowledged and considered during this planning process. Tribes also expressed concerns with the reduction of the Monument and the timeline for the planning effort. Tribes asked for continued consultation, including a visit to an All Pueblo Council of Governors meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico. In response to their request, State Director Ed Roberson committed to attend and present the BENM planning effort to the council.

The BLM and USFS drafted an American Indian Tribal Collaboration Framework (Appendix F) to provide structure and meaning to future collaboration and consultation with the Shash Jáa Commission and interested American Indian Tribes during the development and implementation of the MMPs. This collaboration framework was shared with the Shash Jáa Commission/Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition and the interested Tribes as an attachment to a letter dated July 13, 2018. The July 13, 2018, letter included an invitation to the Shash Jáa Commission and interested Tribes to participate in a conference call held on July 25, 2018. Representatives from the Pueblos of Acoma and San Felipe, the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the USFS, and the BLM participated in the call. A follow-up email for this conference call was sent to the Shash Jáa Commission and interested Tribes on July 30, 2018, that included the American Indian Tribal Framework. The email was also sent to Tribal governments and representatives of the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, and the Pueblo of Zuni (Tribes that comprise the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition). The email included a reminder of meetings for government-to-government consultation and the Shash Jáa Commission that were on August 29 and 30, 2018.

In advance of the August 29, 2018, meeting for all Tribes, the BLM met with the Pueblo of San Felipe privately on August 29, 2018, to discuss cooperating agency status. At the all Tribes meeting later that day, the BLM met with representatives from the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe and the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition. The invitation for the meeting was included in letters sent on July 13, 2018, to the 31 Tribes for government-to-government consultation and to the Shash Jáa Commission/Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition. In that letter, a meeting was offered to the Shash Jáa Commission/Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition for August 30, 2018;

however, the representatives for the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition verbally notified the BLM that no one would be attending.

On August 17, 2018, the BLM notified the 31 tribes of the availability of the Draft MMPs/EIS for comment. The letter included information about locating the Draft MMPs/EIS and other documents on BLM's ePlanning website and how to comment on the Draft MMPs/EIS.

In the fall of 2018, the BLM held multiple consultation meetings with the Tribes that expressed interest in the BENM and development of the MMPs. The BLM met with the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians near Fredonia, Arizona, on September 20, 2018. The BLM met with representatives from the Pueblo of Acoma on October 9 and 10, 2018, to discuss the BENM planning effort and other topics in the Monticello Field Office. The BLM met with the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe in Montrose, Colorado, on October 11, 2018, with the intention of discussing the BENM, but the Tribes informed the BLM that they were advised not to discuss the BENM. On October 17, 18, and 19, the BLM, including State Director Ed Roberson, went to New Mexico to present to the All Pueblo Council of Governors and consult with Tribal representatives at the Pueblo of Laguna, the Pueblo of Acoma, and the Pueblo of San Felipe.

In a letter dated December 14, 2018, the Tribes were invited to a government-to-government consultation meeting on January 9, 2019, and a consulting party meeting on January 10, 2019. These meetings were not held as scheduled as a result of the lapse in appropriations for the BLM. In a letter dated January 30, 2019, the Tribes were notified that the meetings were rescheduled, that a government-to-government consultation meeting would be held on February 27, 2019, and that a consulting party meeting would be held on February 28, 2019.

On February 27, 2019, 15 Tribal representatives from the Ute Mountain Ute, Navajo Nation-Navajo Utah Commission, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Pueblo of Santa Clara, Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of San Felipe, Pueblo of Acoma, Southern Ute Tribe, and the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians attended or participated via telephone in a consultation meeting to discuss the potential impacts to cultural resources resulting from management actions within the Monument.

On April 15, 2019, the BLM sent letters to American Indian tribes and Navajo Nation chapter houses requesting face-to-face meetings in order to provide updates and continue tribal consultation and coordination efforts for the planning effort. Follow-up emails reiterating this request were sent by the BLM on May 3, 2019. In response, Monticello Field Office Manager Gary Torres and BENM Native American Coordinator Cameron Cox traveled to New Mexico to meet with the Pueblos of San Felipe and Tesuque on May 22–23, 2019, and the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna on June 20, 2019. As part of this effort, State Director Ed Roberson and Canyon Country District Manager Lance Porter provided an informal briefing on the planning process to the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition in Durango, Colorado, on June 20, 2019.

Additional communication and government-to-government consultation between all interested Tribes, the BLM, and the USFS is ongoing. As part of the desire to build strong relationships with American Indian tribes, the BLM and USFS will continue to attend informal face-to-face meetings and participate in informal telephone conversations with various Tribal leaders and representatives to discuss the preparation and content of the MMPs. Additional formal government-to-government consultation and informal conversations are expected to continue among the interested Tribes, the BLM, and the USFS throughout the development and implementation of the MMPs.

Table ES-5. American Indian Tribes Invited to Participate in Government-to-Government Consultation

All Pueblo Council of Governors*	Pueblo of Pojoaque
Colorado River Indian Tribes	Pueblo of San Felipe
Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservation	Pueblo of San Ildefonso
Hopi Tribe	Pueblo of Sandia
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians	Pueblo of Santa Ana
Navajo Nation	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Navajo Utah Commission*	Pueblo of Santo Domingo (Kewa)
Navajo Nation, Oljato Chapter	Pueblo of Taos

Navajo Nation, Red Mesa Chapter	Pueblo of Tesuque
Northwest Band of Shoshone Nation	Pueblo of Ysleta del Sur
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	Pueblo of Zia
Pueblo of Acoma	Pueblo of Zuni
Pueblo of Cochiti	San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
Pueblo of Isleta	Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
Pueblo of Jemez	Southern Ute Tribe
Pueblo of Laguna	Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe
Pueblo of Nambe	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Pueblo of Ohkay Owingeh	White Mesa Community of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Pueblo of Picuris	

* Consultation letters are sent to the Navajo Utah Commission and the All Pueblo Council of Governors as a courtesy; this does not constitute government-to-government consultation.

ES.1.6.5. Shash Jáa Commission

Proclamation 9558 established the Bears Ears Commission, which is composed of one elected officer each from the Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe, and Pueblo of Zuni designated by the officers' respective Tribes. Proclamation 9558 directed the BLM and the USFS to "meaningfully engage the Commission or, should the Commission no longer exist, the Tribal governments through some other entity composed of elected Tribal government officers (comparable entity), in the development of the management plan and to inform subsequent management of the monument." Proclamation 9681 renamed the Commission the Shash Jáa Commission and modified Proclamation 9558 to clarify that the Commission shall apply only to the Shash Jáa Unit and shall also include the elected officer of the San Juan County Commission representing District 3 acting in that officer's official capacity.

On March 16, 2018, the BLM and USFS sent letters to the Hopi Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe, and the Pueblo of Zuni inviting Tribal leaders to participate in an organizing meeting of the Shash Jáa Commission. An elected officer of the San Juan County Commission representing District 3 was also invited to attend. On April 6, 2018, the five Indian Nations identified in the Proclamation (also referred to as the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition) notified the BLM and the USFS in writing that they would not attend Shash Jáa Commission meetings. The elected representative from San Juan County also did not attend the meeting. Throughout the development of the MMPs/EIS, the BLM and USFS have continued to engage representatives of organizations that comprise the Shash Jáa Commission and remind them of the opportunity to participate in the Commission. During this and other outreach completed by the BLM and USFS, the entities that comprise the Shash Jáa Commission have not indicated an interest in convening a meeting of the Shash Jáa Commission.

The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition further indicated that they would work with the agencies through government-to-government consultation. The five Indian Nations that were to be represented on the Shash Jáa Commission also have been invited to participate in the development of the MMPs/EIS as cooperating agencies. The BLM and USFS are also consulting with the Tribes as required by the National Historic Preservation Act and will continue to encourage the Tribes and San Juan County to participate in the Shash Jáa Commission.

ES.1.6.6. Monument Advisory Committee

Presidential Proclamation 9558 provides that "the Secretaries, through the BLM and USFS, shall establish an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App) to provide information and advice regarding the development of the management plan and, as appropriate, management of the monument." The Monument Advisory Committee's charter was signed on August 24, 2018, and memorialized a 15-member committee that includes State and local government officials, Tribal members, representatives of the recreation community, local business owners, and private landowners in compliance with Proclamation 9558. A call for nominations was published in the *Federal Register* on August 30, 2018. The Secretary of the Interior appointed the Monument Advisory Committee's members on April 11, 2019, and a notice of public meeting for the Monument Advisory Committee was published in the *Federal* Register

on May 3, 2019. The first Monument Advisory Committee meeting was held on June 5 and 6, 2019. During the meeting on June 5 and 6, 2019, the Monument Advisory Committee heard presentations about and discussed the MMPs, took public comment, and provided the BLM and the USFS input on issues related to the development of the MMPs and management of resources within the Monument. This input included recommendations addressing cultural resources, fire management, lands and realty, lands with wilderness characteristics, livestock grazing, target shooting, and recreation. The BLM and USFS used and incorporated these recommendations in the development of Alternative E and the Proposed MMPs/Final EIS where appropriate.

This page intentionally left blank.